

Attachment C

The following documents have issues about which the Defendants in *United States v. Dana Jarvis, et al.*, Cr. No. 05-1849 JH, seek clarification.

1. Exhibit 2 bears the footer “2-D.Jarvis-9421”. Beginning at page 33, the footer reads 2-D.Jarvis-9421/B of A – Defendants request confirmation that this is a continuous exhibit.
2. Exhibit 29 bears the footer “29-Community/Fitzner/Jarvis-1353/1007/3747”. There are three (3) copies of page 13, each of which is different. Defendants request clarification of this duplicitous page 13.
3. Exhibit 37 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 37 bears the footer “37-B of A/Jarvis/2265”, comprises 1,774 pages, and has an inconsistent Bates numbering protocol. Pages 1-451 bear a number-only Bates, e.g., 1, 2, 3 . . . 451. Pages 452-1,774 bear a “P” as a prefix, i.e., P452, P453, P454 . . . P1774. Defendants request clarification on this numbering protocol. The second instance of Exhibit 37 comprises 356 pages and is numbered 1-356. The exhibit footer is “37-B of A/Jarvis/2265/SECTION 2” where “SECTION 2” is appended as a footer suffix. Defendants request clarification of this Bates overlapping and “SECTION 2” definition.
4. Exhibit 38 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 38 bears the footer “38-B of A/Jarvis/2936”, comprises 5,947 pages, and has an inconsistent Bates numbering protocol. Pages 1-64 bear a number-only Bates, e.g., 1, 2, 3 . . . 64. [N.B. Pages 64 to 200 are missing in this document. See Attachment B]. Pages 201-5,947 bear a “P” as a prefix, i.e., P201, P202, P203 . . . P5947. Defendants request clarification on this numbering protocol. The second instance of Exhibit 38 comprises 521 pages and is numbered 1-521. The exhibit footer is “38-B of A/Jarvis/2936/section 2” where “section 2” is appended as a footer suffix. Defendants request clarification of this Bates overlapping and “section 2” definition.
5. Exhibit 43 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 43 bears the footer “43-1ST State/Jarvis/4527”, comprises 597 pages, and has an inconsistent Bates numbering protocol. Page 1 bears a number-only Bates, i.e., 1. [N.B. Pages 2 to 99 are missing in this document. See Attachment B]. Pages 100-597 bear a “P” as a prefix, P100, P101, P102 . . . P597. Defendants request clarification of this numbering protocol. The second instance of Exhibit 43 bears the same footer “43-1st State/Jarvis/4527”, comprises 99 pages and is numbered P1-P99. Ostensibly this Bates range would fit in the first 99 pages of the 597-page instance but for the fact that Page 1 of each of the instances is different. Defendants request clarification of this Bates and duplicitous Page 1 instance.

6. Exhibit 52 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 52 bears the footer “52-Bank one/Jarvis/5861”, comprises 288 pages and is numbered 1-288. The second instance of Exhibit 52 bears the footer “52-Bank one/Jarvis/5157”, comprises 362 pages and is numbered 1-362. Defendants request clarification of the Exhibit 52 designation.
7. Exhibit 78 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 78 bears the footer “78-Sunstate/Reid/1021/1012”, comprises 807 pages and is ostensibly numbered 1-807. [N.B. Pages 1 to 4 are missing in this document. See Attachment B]. The second instance of Exhibit 78 bears the footer “78-Sunstate/Reid/1021/1012/part 2” where “part 2” is appended as a footer suffix, comprises 196 pages numbered 1-196. While the Bates-number overlaps, the discrete document pages are different. Defendants request clarification of the Bates-numbering schema.
8. Exhibit 85 is provided in two (2) forms. The first instance of Exhibit 85 bears the footer “85-Mossman CPA/Jarvis tax returns”, comprises 694 pages and is numbered 1-694. The second instance of Exhibit 85 bears the footer “85-Mossman CPA/Jarvis tax returns, comprises 673 pages, and is ostensibly numbered 1-673. [N.B. Pages 1 to 532 are missing in this document. See Attachment B]. While the Bates-number overlaps, the discrete document pages are different. Defendants request clarification of the Bates-numbering schema.